arXiv:1703.01866v1 [stat.ME] 6 Mar 2017

Weighted empirical likelihood for quantile regression with nonignorable missing covariates

Xiaohui Yuan[a*] and He Si

[a]*School of Basic Science, Changchun University of Technology, Changchun, China*

Abstract: In this paper, we propose an empirical likelihood-based weighted (ELW) estimator of regression parameter in quantile regression model with nonignorable missing covariates. The proposed ELW estimator is computationally simple and more efficient than the CCA estimator. Simulation results show that the ELW method works remarkably well in finite samples. A real data example is used to illustrate the proposed ELW method.

Keywords: Empirical likelihood; Nonignorable missing; Quantile regression

1 Introduction

Quantile regression (Koenker and Bassett,1978) is robust against outliers and can describe the entire conditional distribution of the response variable given the covariates. Let Y denote the outcome variable, Z be a vector of covariates which is always observed, and X be a vector of covariates which may not be observed for all subjects. The quantile regression model assumes that the τ-th conditional quantile of Y given X and Z:

$$Q_\tau(Y|X,Z,\beta^*) = \beta_0^* + X^T\beta_1^* + Z^T\beta_2^* = W^T\beta^*, \tag{1.1}$$

where $W = (1, X^T, Z^T)^T$ and $\beta^* = (\beta_0^*, \beta_1^{*T}, \beta_2^{*T})^T$ is interior to parameter space Θ, Θ is a compact subset of R^p. We are interested in the inference about β^* based on a random sample of incomplete data

$$(Y_i, X_i^T, Z_i^T, \delta_i), \quad i = 1, \cdots, n,$$

where all the Z_i's and Y_i's are observed, and $\delta_i = 0$ if X_i is missing, otherwise $\delta_i = 1$. The well-known complete-case-analysis (CCA) esitmator of β^* is given by

$$\hat{\beta}_C = \arg\min_{\beta\in\Theta} \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} \delta_i \rho_\tau(Y_i - W_i^T\beta), \tag{1.2}$$

*Corresponding author.
Email addresses: yuanxh@ccut.edu.cn (Xiaohui Yuan)

where $\rho_\tau(u) = u\{\tau - I(u < 0)\}$ is the quantile loss function and $I(\cdot)$ is the indicator function.

The CCA estimator is computationally simple but can be biased when X_i's are not missing completely at random. Consistent and efficient estimators have been proposed in the statistical literature for the quantile regression model when the covariates data are missing at random (MAR). See for example, Wei et al. (2012), Sherwood et al.(2013), Chen et al. (2015), Liu and Yuan (2016).

In this paper, we propose an empirical likelihood-based weighted (ELW) estimator for quantile regression model with nonignorable missing covariates under a "not missing at random" (NMAR) assumption

$$Y \perp \delta | X, Z \tag{1.3}$$

which was proposed by Bartlett et al. (2014) in the context of mean regression model. The NMAR assumption (1.3) implies that, missingness in a covariate depends on the value of that covariate, but is conditionally independent of outcome. The CCA estimator is valid but inefficient under the assumption (1.3) because it fails to draw on the observed information contained in the incomplete cases. The proposed ELW estimator is computationally simple as the CCA estimator and more efficient than the CCA estimator if the probability of missingness is correctly specified.

Empirical likelihood is a useful tool for finding estimators, constructing confidence regions, and testing hypotheses. The book by Owen (2001) contains a comprehensive account of developments in empirical likelihood. For applications of empirical likelihood in missing-data problems, one can refer to Wang and Rao (2002), Qin et al. (2009), Liu and Yuan (2012), Liu et al. (2013), among others.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In section 2, we introduce the empirical likelihood-based weighted estimator for quantile regression model. Numerical studies are reported in sections 3-4. Lemmas needed are given in the Appendix.

2 The empirical likelihood-based weighted estimation

In this section, we extend the augmented complete-case-analysis (ACC) approach in Bartlett et al. (2014) to quantile regression model under the assumption (1.3) and propose the ELW estimator of β^*. We use the missing model in Bartlett et

al. (2014) for estimating the probability of missingness given Y and Z. Following Bartlett et al. (2014), the probability of X being observed under the conditional independence assumption (1.3) is described by the probability model:

$$P(\delta = 1|Y, Z) = \pi(Y, Z, \gamma^*),$$

where γ^* is a $q \times 1$ unknown vector parameter. It is natural to estimate γ^* by the binomial likelihood estimator $\hat{\gamma}$ which maximizes the binomial log-likelihood

$$L_B(\gamma) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} [\delta_i \log\{\pi(Y_i, Z_i, \gamma)\} + (1 - \delta_i) \log\{1 - \pi(Y_i, Z_i, \gamma)\}].$$

Let $m(Y_i, Z_i, \beta, \alpha)$ be a working model of $E\{\delta_i \phi(X_i, Z_i, Y_i, \beta)|Z_i, Y_i\}$ and α^* be the true value of α. Let $\hat{\alpha}$ denote an $n^{1/2}$-consistent estimator of α^*, i.e. $n^{1/2}(\hat{\alpha} - \alpha^*) = O_p(1)$. The ACC estimator $\hat{\beta}_{ACC}$ is defined as a solution to the following estimating equations

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} \{\delta_i \phi(X_i, Z_i, Y_i, \beta) + [\delta_i - \pi(Y_i, Z_i, \hat{\gamma})] m(Z_i, Y_i, \beta, \hat{\alpha})\} = 0, \tag{2.1}$$

where $\phi(X_i, Z_i, Y_i, \beta) = W_i\{I(Y_i - W_i^T\beta < 0) - \tau\}$. Since the non-smooth estimating function $\phi(X_i, Z_i, Y_i, \beta)$ involves the indicator function $I(\cdot)$, solving equation (2.1) with respect to β may be difficult to accomplish. To reduce the computational burden of $\hat{\beta}_{ACC}$, we proposed the empirical likelihood-weighted estimator of β^*. Define

$$\begin{aligned}
U_B(\delta_i, Z_i, Y_i, \gamma) &= \frac{\delta_i - \pi(Y_i, Z_i, \gamma)}{\pi(Y_i, Z_i, \gamma)\{1 - \pi(Y_i, Z_i, \gamma)\}} \frac{\partial \pi(Y_i, Z_i, \gamma)}{\partial \gamma}, \\
g_1(\delta_i, X_i, Z_i, Y_i, \theta) &= [\delta_i - \pi(Y_i, Z_i, \gamma)] m(Z_i, Y_i, \beta, \alpha), \\
g(\delta_i, X_i, Z_i, Y_i, \theta) &= \begin{pmatrix} g_1(\delta_i, X_i, Z_i, Y_i, \theta) \\ U_B(\delta_i, Z_i, Y_i, \gamma) \end{pmatrix}.
\end{aligned}$$

Let p_i represent the probability weight allocated to $g(\delta_i, X_i, Z_i, Y_i, \hat{\theta})$, where $\hat{\theta} = (\hat{\alpha}^T, \hat{\beta}_C^T, \hat{\gamma}^T)^T$. It can be shown that $E\{g(\delta_i, X_i, Z_i, Y_i, \theta^*)\} = 0$ when $\pi(y, z, \gamma)$ is correctly specified. Then, we maximize the empirical likelihood function $\prod_{i=1}^{n} p_i$ subject to the constraints

$$p_i \geq 0, \quad \sum_{i=1}^{n} p_i = 1, \quad \sum_{i=1}^{n} p_i g(\delta_i, X_i, Z_i, Y_i, \hat{\theta}) = 0.$$

By using the Lagrange multiplier method, we get

$$\hat{p}_i = \frac{1}{n}\frac{1}{1+\hat{\lambda}^T g(\delta_i, X_i, Z_i, Y_i, \hat{\theta})},$$

where $\hat{\lambda}$ is the Lagrange multiplier that satisfies

$$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\frac{g(\delta_i, X_i, Z_i, Y_i, \hat{\theta})}{1+\hat{\lambda}^T g(\delta_i, X_i, Z_i, Y_i, \hat{\theta})} = 0.$$

The empirical likelihood-based weighted estimator of β^* is given by

$$\hat{\beta}_{ELW} = \arg\min_{\beta\in\Theta}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\hat{p}_i\delta_i\rho_\tau(Y_i - W_i^T\beta). \tag{2.2}$$

Define

$$\lambda(\theta) = \arg\max_{\lambda}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\log\{1+\lambda^T g(\delta_i, X_i, Z_i, Y_i, \theta)\}. \tag{2.3}$$

From (2.2), it is easily seen $\hat{\lambda} = \lambda(\hat{\theta})$. For fixed $\theta = \hat{\theta}$, solving (2.3) is a well-behaved optimization problem since the objective function is globally concave and can be solved by a simple Newton-Raphson numerical procedure. Once the $\hat{\lambda}$ and $\hat{p}_i$'s are calculated, $\hat{\beta}_{ELW}$ can be obtained by using the R package `quantreg`.

Let $F_i(\cdot)$ and $f_i(\cdot)$ denote respectively the conditional distribution and density functions of Y_i given (X_i, Z_i). The following regularity conditions help us in doing asymptotic analysis:

C1 The τ-th conditional quantile of Y_i given W_i is $Q_\tau(Y_i|W_i, \beta^*) = W_i^T\beta^*$ and W_i has a bounded support.

C2 F_β, S_ϕ, S_B, V_2 are positive definite.

C3 $F_i(\cdot)$ is absolutely continuous and $f_i(\cdot)$ is uniformly bounded away from 0 and ∞ at 0.

C4 (a) $\inf_{(Y,Z)}\pi(Y, Z, \gamma^*) \geq c_0$ for some $c_0 > 0$. (b) For all (Y_i, Z_i), $\pi(Y_i, Z_i, \gamma)$ admits all third partial derivatives $\frac{\partial^3\pi(Y_i,Z_i,\gamma)}{\partial\gamma_k\partial\gamma_l\partial\gamma_m}$ for all γ in a neighborhood of the true value γ^*, $\left\|\frac{\partial^3\pi(Y_i,Z_i,\gamma)}{\partial\gamma_k\partial\gamma_l\partial\gamma_m}\right\|$ is bounded by an integrable function for all γ in this neighborhood, and $\|\partial\pi(Y_i, Z_i, \gamma)/\partial\gamma\|^2$ is bounded by an integrable function for all γ in this neighborhood.

C5 For all (Y_i, Z_i), $m(Y_i, Z_i, \beta, \alpha)$ admits all second partial derivatives $\frac{m(Y_i,Z_i,\beta,\alpha)}{\partial\beta_i\partial\beta_j}$ and $\frac{m(Y_i,Z_i,\beta,\alpha)}{\partial\alpha_i\partial\alpha_j}$ for all β and α in a neighborhood of $(\beta^{*T}, \alpha^{*T})^T$. $\|m(Y_i, Z_i, \beta, \alpha)\|^2$ and $\|\frac{m(Y_i,Z_i,\beta,\alpha)}{\partial\beta_i\partial\beta_j}\|$ and $\|\frac{m(Y_i,Z_i,\beta,\alpha)}{\partial\alpha_i\partial\alpha_j}\|$ are bounded by an integrable function for all β and α in this neighborhood.

Denote

$$\begin{aligned}
F_\beta &= E\left\{\delta_i f_i(0) W_i W_i^T\right\},\\
S_\phi &= E\left\{\delta_i \phi(X_i, Z_i, Y_i, \beta^*)\phi^T(X_i, Z_i, Y_i, \beta^*)\right\},\\
D_1 &= E\left\{[\delta_i - \pi(Y_i, Z_i, \gamma^*)]^2 m(Z_i, Y_i, \beta^*, \alpha^*) m^T(Z_i, Y_i, \beta^*, \alpha^*)\right\},\\
D_2 &= E\left\{[\delta_i - \pi(Y_i, Z_i, \gamma^*)] m(Z_i, Y_i, \beta^*, \alpha^*) U_B^T(\delta_i, Z_i, Y_i, \gamma^*)\right\},\\
D_3 &= E\left\{\delta_i[\delta_i - \pi(Y_i, Z_i, \gamma^*)]\phi(X_i, Z_i, Y_i, \beta^*) m^T(Z_i, Y_i, \beta^*, \alpha^*)\right\},\\
D_4 &= E\left\{\delta_i \phi(X_i, Z_i, Y_i, \beta^*) U_B^T(\delta_i, Z_i, Y_i, \gamma^*)\right\},\\
S_B &= E\left\{U_B(\delta_i, Z_i, Y_i, \gamma^*) U_B^T(\delta_i, Z_i, Y_i, \gamma^*)\right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

The asymptotic distribution of $\hat{\beta}_C$ is given by the following theorem.

Theorem 2.1 *Under conditions C1-C3,* $n^{1/2}(\hat{\beta}_C - \beta^*) \xrightarrow{d} N(0, \Sigma_C)$ *as* $n \to \infty$, *where*

$$\Sigma_C = F_\beta^{-1} S_\phi F_\beta^{-1}.$$

The proof is similar to the proof of Theorem 4.1 in Koenker (2005, page 120). The asymptotic distribution of $\hat{\beta}_{ELW}$ is given by the following theorem.

Theorem 2.2 *Under conditions C1-C5,* $n^{1/2}(\hat{\beta}_{ELW} - \beta^*) \xrightarrow{d} N(0, \Sigma_{ELW})$ *as* $n \to \infty$, *where*

$$\Sigma_{ELW} = F_\beta^{-1}\left(S_\phi - V_1 V_2^{-1} V_1^T\right) F_\beta^{-1} = \Sigma_C - F_\beta^{-1} V_1 V_2^{-1} V_1^T F_\beta^{-1},$$

$V_1 = D_3 - D_4 S_B^{-1} D_2^T$ *and* $V_2 = D_1 - D_2 S_B^{-1} D_2^T$.

For two matrices A and B, we write $A \le B$ if $B - A$ is a nonnegative-definite matrix.

Corollary 2.1 *If both* F_β *and* V_2 *are positive definite, we have* $\Sigma_{ELW} \le \Sigma_C$, *and the equality holds if and only if* $V_1 = 0$.

Corollary 2.1 reveals that $\hat{\beta}_{ELW}$ is at least as efficient as $\hat{\beta}_C$ for any working regression function $m(Y_i, Z_i, \beta, \alpha)$, whether or not it correctly identifies the optimal regression function $E\{\phi(X_i, Z_i, Y_i, \beta)|Z_i, Y_i, \delta_i = 1\}$. Although $\hat{\beta}_{ELW}$ can be obtained easily, it is difficult to estimate the limiting covariance matrix analytically. We apply the resampling method in Liu and Yuan (2016) to the inference about β^*.

3 Simulation studies

In this section, we investigate the performance of the proposed estimator $\hat{\beta}_{ELW}$ and several other estimators based on Monte-Carlo simulations.

The simulated data are generated by the procedure of Bartlett et al. (2014), in which the non-missing indicator δ is distributed with $P(\delta = 1) = 0.5$, and (X, Z, Y) is generated from a trivariate normal distribution conditional on δ:

$$(X, Z, Y)^T | \delta \sim N((\delta, 0, \eta\delta)^T, \Psi),$$

where $\Psi = (\sigma_{ab})$, $a, b = x, y, z$, $\eta = (\sigma_{xy}\sigma_{zz} - \sigma_{xz}\sigma_{zy})\upsilon_1$ and $\upsilon_1 = (\sigma_{xx}\sigma_{zz} - \sigma_{xz}^2)^{-1}$.

It is easy to verify that the assumption $\delta \perp Y | (X, Z)$ is satisfied in this setup. Conditional on Z and Y, the probability of $P(\delta = 1|Z, Y)$ is a logistic regression with

$$P(\delta = 1|Z, Y) = \frac{\exp(\gamma_0 + \gamma_1 Z + \gamma_2 Y)}{1 + \exp(\gamma_0 + \gamma_1 Z + \gamma_2 Y)}$$

where $\gamma_0 = -0.5\eta^2\sigma_{zz}\upsilon_2, \gamma_1 = -\eta\sigma_{zy}\upsilon_2, \gamma_2 = \eta\sigma_{zz}\upsilon_2$ and $\upsilon_2 = (\sigma_{zz}\sigma_{yy} - \sigma_{zy}^2)^{-1}$. The conditional quantile model of interest is specified as

$$Q_\tau(Y|X, Z) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X + \beta_2 Z,$$

with $\beta_0 = \Phi^{-1}(\tau, \sigma^2)$, $\beta_1 = (\sigma_{xy}\sigma_{zz} - \sigma_{xz}\sigma_{zy})\upsilon_1$, $\beta_2 = (\sigma_{zy}\sigma_{xx} - \sigma_{xz}\sigma_{xy})\upsilon_1$, $\sigma^2 = \sigma_{yy} - (\sigma_{xz}^2\sigma_{zz} - 2\sigma_{xz}^2\sigma_{zy} + \sigma_{zy}^2\sigma_{xx})\upsilon_1$.

We set $\sigma_{xx} = \sigma_{yy} = \sigma_{zz} = 1$, $\sigma_{xz} = \sigma_{xy} = \sigma_{zy} = 0.5$ and generate 1000 Monte Carlo data sets of sample sizes $n = 100$ and 300. Five estimators are considered:

1. $\hat{\beta}_{ideal}$: the quantile regression estimator with the full observations. This is the ideal case, but it is not feasible in practice. Nevertheless, we used it as a benchmark for comparison;

2. $\hat{\beta}_C$: the CCA estimator defined in equation (1.2);

3. $\hat{\beta}_{IPWMAR}$: the IPW estimator assuming MAR, introduced in Sherwood et al. (2013);

4. $\hat{\beta}_{ELWMAR}$: the ELW estimator assuming MAR, proposed by Liu and Yuan (2016);

5. $\hat{\beta}_{ELW}$: the ELW estimator defined in equation (2.2).

The empirical bias and the root-mean-squared errors (RMSEs) of the proposed estimators with sample sizes of 100 and 300 are reported in Table 1. The results can be summarized as follows: the CCA estimator $\hat{\beta}_C$ and the ELW estimator $\hat{\beta}_{ELW}$ are unbiased as expected. While $\hat{\beta}_{IPWMAR}$ and $\hat{\beta}_{ELWMAR}$ for β_0 are clearly biased. $\hat{\beta}_{ELW}$ performs better than $\hat{\beta}_C$ in terms of RMSE in most cases, which agrees with our theory. $\hat{\beta}_C$ and $\hat{\beta}_{ELW}$ are improved in terms of RMSE as the sample size n goes up from 100 to 300.

By applying the resampling method in Liu and Yuan (2016), we obtain 95% confidence intervals for $\beta_j, j = 0, 1, 2$. The number of the resampling replications is set to be 200. Tables 2 summarizes the empirical coverage probabilities and the average lengths of CCA and ELW confidence intervals of β_i, $i = 0, 1, 2$ with sample sizes of 100 and 300. The coverage probabilities of CCA and ELW confidence intervals are close to the nominal level of 95%. The ELW confidence intervals have smaller mean lengths than those of the CCA confidence intervals.

4 Data analysis

In this section, we apply the proposed method to the data on alcohol consumption, age, body mass index and systolic blood pressure from the 2013-2014 NHANES. We model the population quantile of SBP (systolic blood pressure) as a function of the following four covariates: BMI (body mass index), Alcohol (log{alcohol consumption per day+1}), Age ({age $-$ 50}/10), and Age^2 ({age $-$ 50}^{2}/100).

In our analysis, there are 7104 observations in the data set, where the dependent variable SBP and the covariates BMI and Age have complete data, the covariate Alcohol are missing 53.29%. It is a priori plausible that missingness in Alcohol is primarily dependent on the value of itself (i.e. MNAR), and that missingness in Alcohol is independent of SBP conditional on Alcohol, BMI, Age, and Age^2. Consequently, CCA is expected to give valid inferences, while the MAR assumption likely does not hold.

For $i = 1, \cdots, n = 7104$, let Y_i denote the ith observation of Y =SBP, Z_i denote the ith observation of Z=(BMI, Age, Age^2)^T and X_i denote the ith observation of X =Alcohol. Then, we consider the following model for the τth conditional quantile of Y_i given $W_i = (1, X_i, Z_i^T)^T$:

$$Q_\tau(Y_i|X_i, Z_i, \beta) = \beta_0 + X_i\beta_1 + Z_i^T\beta_2, i = 1, \cdots, n,$$

where $\beta = (\beta_0, \beta_1, \beta_2^T)^T$ and $\beta_2 = (\beta_{21}, \beta_{22}, \beta_{23})^T$. We consider two estimators $\hat{\beta}_C$ and $\hat{\beta}_{ELW}$. For the ELW method, the probability of whether the Alcohol is observed is modeled by $\pi(Y, Z, \gamma) = \{1 + \exp(-\gamma_0 - Y\gamma_1 - Z^T\gamma_2)\}^{-1}$.

Table 3 gives the estimated regression coefficients, $\hat{\beta}_C$ and $\hat{\beta}_{ELW}$, and corresponding 95% confidence intervals for β_1, β_{21}, β_{22} and β_{23} at quantile level $\tau = 0.5$. The CCA and ELW methods produce similar estimated regression coefficients and the ELW confidence intervals based on $\hat{\beta}_{ELW}$ have smaller lengths than the CCA confidence intervals based on $\hat{\beta}_C$, in most cases.

Acknowledgements

Xiaohui Yuan was partly supported by the NSFC (No.11401048, 11671054) and the Natural Science Foundation for Young Scientists of Jilin Province, China (No.20150520055JH).

Appendix

In the section, we list a preliminary lemma which has been used in the proofs of the main results in section 2.

Lemma A. 1 *Under conditions C1-C5, we have*

$$\hat{\lambda} = \lambda(\hat{\theta}) = n^{-1} S_g^{-1} \left[U_g(\theta^*) + G_\gamma S_B^{-1} U(\gamma^*) \right] + o_p(n^{-1/2}),$$

where $\lambda(\theta)$ is defined in (2.3).

The proof of Lemma A.1 By Lemma A.2 in Liu and Yuan (2016), we have

$$\hat{\lambda} = \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} g(\delta_i, X_i, Z_i, Y_i, \hat{\theta}) g^T(\delta_i, X_i, Z_i, Y_i, \hat{\theta}) \right\}^{-1} n^{-1} U_g(\hat{\theta}) + o_p(n^{-1/2}),$$

where $U_g(\theta) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} g(\delta_i, X_i, Z_i, Y_i, \theta)$. By a Taylor expansion,

$$\begin{aligned} & n^{-1} U_g(\hat{\theta}) \\ = \; & n^{-1} U_g(\theta^*) + n^{-1} \frac{\partial U_g(\tilde{\theta})}{\partial \alpha^T} (\hat{\alpha} - \alpha^*) + n^{-1} \frac{\partial U_g(\tilde{\theta})}{\partial \beta^T} (\hat{\beta}_C - \beta^*) + n^{-1} \frac{\partial U_g(\tilde{\theta})}{\partial \gamma^T} (\hat{\gamma} - \gamma^*), \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{\theta}$ is a point on the segment connecting $\hat{\theta}$ and θ^*. By the law of large numbers, we have

$$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} g(\delta_i, X_i, Z_i, Y_i, \hat{\theta}) g^T(\delta_i, X_i, Z_i, Y_i, \hat{\theta}) \xrightarrow{p} \begin{pmatrix} D_1 & D_2 \\ D_2^T & S_B \end{pmatrix} = S_g,$$

$$n^{-1}\frac{\partial U_g(\tilde{\theta})}{\partial \gamma^T} \xrightarrow{p} E\left\{\frac{\partial g(\delta_i, X_i, Z_i, Y_i, \theta^*)}{\partial \gamma^T}\right\} = \begin{pmatrix} -D_2 \\ -S_B \end{pmatrix} = G_\gamma,$$

$$n^{-1}\frac{\partial U_g(\tilde{\theta})}{\partial \alpha^T} \xrightarrow{p} 0, \quad n^{-1}\frac{\partial U_g(\tilde{\theta})}{\partial \beta^T} \xrightarrow{p} 0.$$

By the asymptotic properties of maximum likelihood estimate, we have

$$\hat{\gamma} - \gamma^* = n^{-1} S_B^{-1} U(\gamma^*) + o_p(n^{-1/2}),$$

where $U(\gamma^*) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} U_B(\delta_i, Z_i, Y_i, \gamma^*)$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\lambda} &= S_g^{-1}\left\{n^{-1}U_g(\theta^*) + n^{-1}\frac{\partial U_g(\tilde{\theta})}{\partial \gamma^T}(\hat{\gamma} - \gamma^*)\right\} + o_p(n^{-1/2}) \\ &= n^{-1} S_g^{-1}\left[U_g(\theta^*) + G_\gamma S_B^{-1} U(\gamma^*)\right] + o_p(n^{-1/2}). \end{aligned}$$

The desired result follows.

The proof of Theorem 2.2 For $i = 1, \cdots, n$, let

$$A_i(\eta) = \rho_\tau(\varepsilon_i - W_i^T \eta/\sqrt{n}) - \rho_\tau(\varepsilon_i),$$

where $\varepsilon_i = Y_i - W_i^T \beta^*$. The function $A(\eta) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} n\hat{p}_i \delta_i A_i(\eta)$ is convex and is minimized at $\hat{\eta} = \sqrt{n}(\hat{\beta}_{ELW} - \beta^*)$. Following Knight's identity (Knight,1998)

$$\rho(u - v) - \rho(u) = v[I(u < 0) - \tau] + \int_0^v [I(u \le s) - I(u \le 0)]ds,$$

we can write $A(\eta) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} n\hat{p}_i \delta_i A_{1i}(\eta) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} n\hat{p}_i \delta_i A_{2i}(\eta)$, where

$$\begin{aligned} A_{1i}(\eta) &= n^{-1/2}\eta^T \phi(X_i, Z_i, Y_i, \beta^*), \\ A_{2i}(\eta) &= \int_0^{w_i^T \eta/\sqrt{n}} \{I(\varepsilon_i \le s) - I(\varepsilon_i \le 0)\}ds. \end{aligned}$$

We first give the asymptotic expression of $\sum_{i=1}^{n} n\hat{p}_i \delta_i A_{1i}(\eta)$. Applying a Taylor

expansion and Lemma A.1, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{i=1}^{n} n\hat{p}_i\delta_i A_{1i}(\eta) \\
= \;& \eta^T n^{-1/2}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\delta_i\phi(X_i,Z_i,Y_i,\beta^*) \\
& -\eta^T n^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\delta_i\phi(X_i,Z_i,Y_i,\beta^*)g^T(\delta_i,X_i,Z_i,Y_i,\theta^*)n^{1/2}\hat{\lambda}+o_p(1) \\
= \;& \eta^T n^{-1/2}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\delta_i\phi(X_i,Z_i,Y_i,\beta^*)-\eta^T F_g n^{1/2}\hat{\lambda}+o_p(1) \\
= \;& \eta^T n^{-1/2}\left\{U_\phi(\theta^*)-F_g S_g^{-1}\left[U_g(\theta^*)+G_\gamma S_B^{-1}U(\gamma^*)\right]\right\}+o_p(1),
\end{aligned}$$

where $U_\phi(\theta^*)=\sum_{i=1}^n\delta_i\phi(X_i,Z_i,Y_i,\beta^*)$ and $F_g=\begin{pmatrix} D_3 & D_4 \end{pmatrix}$.

Next, we give the asymptotic expression of $\sum_{i=1}^n n\hat{p}_i\delta_i A_{2i}(\eta)$. A Taylor expansion reveals that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} n\hat{p}_i\delta_i A_{2i}(\eta) \;=\; \sum_{i=1}^{n}\delta_i A_{2i}(\eta)-\sum_{i=1}^{n}A_{2i}(\eta)\delta_i g^T(\delta_i,X_i,Z_i,Y_i,\theta^*)\hat{\lambda}+o_p(1).$$

Moreover, similar to the proof of Theorem 4.1 in Koenker(2005, page 120), one can show that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n}\delta_i A_{2i}(\eta) \;=\; \frac{1}{2}\eta^T F_\beta\eta+o_p(1).$$

Thus, we only need to show that $\sum_{i=1}^n A_{2i}(\eta)\delta_i g^T(\delta_i,X_i,Z_i,Y_i,\theta^*)\hat{\lambda}$ is asymptotically negligible. By Lemma A.1 and Lemma D.2 in Kitamura et al. (2004), we have $\|\hat{\lambda}\|=O_p(n^{-1/2})$ and $\max_{1\le i\le n}\{\|g(\delta_i,X_i,Z_i,Y_i,\theta^*)\|\}=o_p(n^{1/2})$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left|\sum_{i=1}^{n}A_{2i}(\eta)\delta_i g^T(\delta_i,X_i,Z_i,Y_i,\theta^*)\hat{\lambda}\right| \\
\le \;& \max_{1\le i\le n}\{\|g(\delta_i,X_i,Z_i,Y_i,\theta^*)\|\}\|\hat{\lambda}\|\left|\sum_{i=1}^{n}\delta_i A_{2i}(\eta)\right|=o_p(1).
\end{aligned}$$

By the asymptotic expressions of $\sum_{i=1}^n n\hat{p}_i\delta_i A_{1i}(\eta)$ and $\sum_{i=1}^n n\hat{p}_i\delta_i A_{2i}(\eta)$, we conclude that $A(\eta)\xrightarrow{d}A_0(\eta)$, where

$$A_0(\eta)=\eta^T n^{-1/2}\left\{U_\phi(\theta^*)-F_g S_g^{-1}\left[U_g(\theta^*)+G_\gamma S_B^{-1}U(\gamma^*)\right]\right\}+\frac{1}{2}\eta^T F_\beta\eta.$$

Then, it follows that

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\beta}_{ELW} - \beta^*) = \hat{\eta} \xrightarrow{d} \arg\min_{\eta} A_0(\eta),$$

where

$$\arg\min_{\eta} A_0(\eta) \;=\; -F_\beta^{-1} n^{-1/2} \left\{ U_\phi(\theta^*) - F_g S_g^{-1} \left[U_g(\theta^*) + G_\gamma S_B^{-1} U(\gamma^*) \right] \right\}.$$

Furthermore, by simple algebra, one can verify that

$$\begin{pmatrix} D_3 & D_4 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} D_1 & D_2 \\ D_2^T & S_B \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \;=\; \begin{pmatrix} V_1 V_2^{-1} & D_4 S_B^{-1} - V_1 V_2^{-1} D_2 S_B^{-1} \end{pmatrix}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & U_g(\theta^*) + G_\gamma S_B^{-1} U(\gamma^*) \\ = \; & \begin{pmatrix} \sum_{i=1}^n [g_1(\delta_i, X_i, Z_i, Y_i, \theta^*) - D_2 S_B^{-1} U_B(\delta_i, Z_i, Y_i, \gamma^*)] \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} & F_g S_g^{-1} \left[U_g(\theta^*) + G_\gamma S_B^{-1} U(\gamma^*) \right] \\ = \; & \begin{pmatrix} D_3 & D_4 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} D_1 & D_2 \\ D_2^T & S_B \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \left[U_g(\theta^*) + G_\gamma S_B^{-1} U(\gamma^*) \right] \\ = \; & V_1 V_2^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \left[g_1(\delta_i, X_i, Z_i, Y_i, \theta^*) - D_2 S_B^{-1} U_B(\delta_i, Z_i, Y_i, \gamma^*) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Let

$$\begin{aligned} h_{1i} &= \delta_i \phi(X_i, Z_i, Y_i, \beta^*), \\ h_{2i} &= g_1(\delta_i, X_i, Z_i, Y_i, \theta^*) - D_2 S_B^{-1} U_B(\delta_i, Z_i, Y_i, \gamma^*). \end{aligned}$$

One can write $\arg\min_\eta A_0(\eta)$ as $-F_\beta^{-1} n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ h_{1i} - V_1 V_2^{-1} h_{2i} \right\}$. It is easily verified that $Var\,(h_{1i}) = E(h_{1i} h_{1i}^T) = S_\phi$,

$$\begin{aligned} E(h_{1i} h_{2i}^T) &= E(h_{1i} g_1^T(\delta_i, X_i, Z_i, Y_i, \theta^*)) - E(h_{1i} U_B^T(\delta_i, Z_i, Y_i, \gamma^*)) S_B^{-1} D_2^T \\ &= D_3^T - D_2 S_B^{-1} D_2^T, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} Var\,(h_{2i}) &= Var(g_1(\delta_i, X_i, Z_i, Y_i, \theta^*)) + D_2 S_B^{-1} Var(U_B(\delta_i, Z_i, Y_i, \gamma^*)) S_B^{-1} D_2^T \\ &\quad - E[g_1(\delta_i, X_i, Z_i, Y_i, \theta^*) U_B^T(\delta_i, Z_i, Y_i, \gamma^*)] S_B^{-1} D_2^T \\ &\quad - D_2 S_B^{-1} E[U_B(\delta_i, Z_i, Y_i, \gamma^*) g_1^T(\delta_i, X_i, Z_i, Y_i, \theta^*)] \\ &= D_1 - D_2 S_B^{-1} D_2^T. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} & Var\left(h_{1i} - V_1 V_2^{-1} h_{2i}\right) \\ = \; & Var(h_{1i}) - V_1 V_2^{-1} E(h_{2i} h_{1i}^T) - E(h_{1i} h_{2i}^T) V_2^{-1} V_1^T + V_1 V_2^{-1} Var(h_{2i}) V_2^{-1} V_1^T \\ = \; & S_\phi - V_1 V_2^{-1} (D_3^T - D_2 S_B^{-1} D_2^T) - (D_3 - D_2 S_B^{-1} D_2^T) V_2^{-1} V_1^T \\ & + V_1 V_2^{-1} (D_1 - D_2 S_B^{-1} D_2^T) V_2^{-1} V_1^T \\ = \; & S_\phi - V_1 V_2^{-1} V_1^T. \end{aligned}$$

The desired result follows by the central limit theorem.

References

[1] Bartlett J W, Carpenter J R, Tilling K, et al. 2014. Improving upon the efficiency of complete case analysis when covariates are MNAR[J]. Biostatistics, 15(4): 719-730.

[2] Chen X, Wan A T K, Zhou Y. 2015. Efficient quantile regression analysis with missing observations[J]. Journal of the American Statistical Association, 110(510):00-00.

[3] Kitamura Y, Tripathi G, Ahn H. 2004. Empirical likelihood-based inference in conditional moment restriction Models[J]. Econometrica, 72(6): 1667-1714.

[4] Knight K. 1998. Limiting distributions for L_1 regression estimators under general conditions[J]. Annals of Statistics, 26: 755-770.

[5] Koenker, R. and Bassett, G. 1978. Regression quantiles. Econometrica,46, 33-50.

[6] Koenker R. 2005. Quantile regression[M]. Cambridge university press.

[7] Liu, T. and Yuan, X. 2012. Combining quasi and empirical likelihoods in generalized linear models with missing responses. Journal of Multivariate Analysis 111, 39-58.

[8] Liu, T., Yuan, X., Li, Z. and Li, Y. 2013. Empirical and weighted conditional likelihoods for matched case-control studies with missing covariates. Journal of Multivariate Analysis 119, 185-199.

[9] Liu T, Yuan X. 2016. Weighted quantile regression with missing covariates using empirical likelihood[J]. Statistics A Journal of Theoretical and Applied Statistics, 50(1):89-113.

[10] Owen, A. B. 2001. Empirical likelihood. Chapman and Hall, New York.

[11] Qin, J., Zhang, B. and Leung, D. H. 2009. Empirical likelihood in missing data problems[J]. Journal of the American Statistical Association, 104: 1492-1503.

[12] Sherwood B, Wang L, Zhou X H. 2013. Weighted quantile regression for analyzing health care cost data with missing covariates.[J]. Statistics in Medicine, 32(28):4967-79.

[13] Wang, Q., and Rao, J. N. K. 2002. Empirical likelihood-based inference under imputation for missing response data[J]. Annals of Statistics, 30: 896-924.

[14] Wei Y, Ma Y, Carroll R J.2012. Multiple imputation in quantile regression[J]. Biometrika, 99(2):423-438.

Table 1: Empirical bias and RMSE (in parentheses) based on 1000 simulations with $n = 100, 300$.

τ	n	Estimator	β_0	β_1	β_2
0.3	100	$\hat{\beta}_{ideal}$	-0.0022 (0.1185)	0.0084 (0.1095)	-0.0062 (0.1272)
		$\hat{\beta}_C$	0.0072 (0.2403)	0.0032 (0.1851)	-0.0030 (0.1853)
		$\hat{\beta}_{IPWMAR}$	-0.1714(0.3065)	0.0130 (0.2128)	-0.0042 (0.2077)
		$\hat{\beta}_{ELWMAR}$	-0.1808 (0.3021)	0.0231 (0.2144)	-0.0120 (0.1945)
		$\hat{\beta}_{ELW}$	-0.0004 (0.2446)	0.0107 (0.1875)	-0.0098 (0.1752)
	300	$\hat{\beta}_{ideal}$	0.0016 (0.0685)	0.0001 (0.0617)	-0.0014 (0.0676)
		$\hat{\beta}_C$	0.0008 (0.1332)	0.0032 (0.1031)	-0.0011 (0.1016)
		$\hat{\beta}_{IPWMAR}$	-0.1669 (0.2188)	0.0133 (0.1167)	-0.0068 (0.1150)
		$\hat{\beta}_{ELWMAR}$	-0.1672 (0.2079)	0.0155 (0.1116)	-0.0097(0.0968)
		$\hat{\beta}_{ELW}$	-0.0007 (0.1252)	0.0053 (0.1002)	-0.0032 (0.0873)
0.5	100	$\hat{\beta}_{ideal}$	-0.0021 (0.1128)	0.0018 (0.0997)	0.0038 (0.1187)
		$\hat{\beta}_C$	0.0016 (0.2347)	0.0014 (0.1781)	0.0073 (0.1765)
		$\hat{\beta}_{IPWMAR}$	-0.1636 (0.2761)	0.0148 (0.1851)	-0.0020 (0.1850)
		$\hat{\beta}_{ELWMAR}$	-0.1693 (0.2794)	0.0209 (0.1814)	-0.0076 (0.1649)
		$\hat{\beta}_{ELW}$	-0.0023 (0.2326)	0.0042 (0.1685)	0.0007 (0.1617)
	300	$\hat{\beta}_{ideal}$	-0.0015 (0.0648)	0.0002 (0.0608)	0.0011 (0.0679)
		$\hat{\beta}_C$	-0.0001 (0.1274)	0.0008 (0.0979)	0.0017 (0.0973)
		$\hat{\beta}_{IPWMAR}$	-0.1646 (0.2040)	0.0136 (0.1036)	-0.0073 (0.1003)
		$\hat{\beta}_{ELWMAR}$	-0.1650 (0.2007)	0.0158 (0.1002)	-0.0087 (0.0891)
		$\hat{\beta}_{ELW}$	-0.0017 (0.1238)	0.0032 (0.0954)	-0.0001 (0.0889)
0.7	100	$\hat{\beta}_{ideal}$	-0.0090 (0.1216)	0.0025 (0.1147)	0.0021 (0.1212)
		$\hat{\beta}_C$	-0.0232 (0.2471)	0.0118 (0.1864)	-0.0042 (0.1791)
		$\hat{\beta}_{IPWMAR}$	-0.1750 (0.2839)	0.0253 (0.1845)	-0.0089 (0.1790)
		$\hat{\beta}_{ELWMAR}$	-0.1772 (0.2901)	0.0263 (0.1868)	-0.0105 (0.1694)
		$\hat{\beta}_{ELW}$	-0.0203 (0.2498)	0.0076 (0.1870)	0.0002 (0.1795)
	300	$\hat{\beta}_{ideal}$	-0.0014 (0.0706)	0.0019 (0.0630)	0.0001 (0.0708)
		$\hat{\beta}_C$	0.0018 (0.1371)	-0.0032 (0.1008)	0.0019 (0.1028)
		$\hat{\beta}_{IPWMAR}$	-0.1576 (0.2007)	0.0136 (0.1046)	-0.0062 (0.1033)
		$\hat{\beta}_{ELWMAR}$	-0.1557 (0.1983)	0.0130 (0.1006)	-0.0059 (0.0935)
		$\hat{\beta}_{ELW}$	0.0025 (0.1325)	-0.0003 (0.0969)	0.0009 (0.0964)

Table 2: The estimated coverage probabilities and the mean lengths of confidence intervals (in parentheses) with 1000 simulations.

τ	n	Estimator	β_0	β_1	β_2
0.3	100	$\hat{\beta}_C$	0.963 (1.0275)	0.966 (0.7921)	0.976 (0.7948)
		$\hat{\beta}_{ELW}$	0.951(0.9644)	0.954 (0.7348)	0.969 (0.7165)
	300	$\hat{\beta}_C$	0.948 (0.5734)	0.960 (0.4403)	0.958 (0.4398)
		$\hat{\beta}_{ELW}$	0.952 (0.5387)	0.958 (0.4075)	0.957 (0.3934)
0.5	100	$\hat{\beta}_C$	0.948 (0.9732)	0.962 (0.7552)	0.973 (0.7600)
		$\hat{\beta}_{ELW}$	0.951 (0.9501)	0.952 (0.7154)	0.959 (0.6966)
	300	$\hat{\beta}_C$	0.954 (0.5449)	0.967 (0.4216)	0.964 (0.4175)
		$\hat{\beta}_{ELW}$	0.949 (0.5268)	0.964 (0.3966)	0.959 (0.3791)
0.7	100	$\hat{\beta}_C$	0.947 (1.0359)	0.972 (0.7950)	0.963 (0.7881)
		$\hat{\beta}_{ELW}$	0.939 (0.9992)	0.940 (0.7455)	0.942 (0.7156)
	300	$\hat{\beta}_C$	0.954 (0.5731)	0.969 (0.4370)	0.963 (0.4351)
		$\hat{\beta}_{ELW}$	0.963 (0.5612)	0.962 (0.4140)	0.961 (0.4012)

Table 3: The estimated regression coefficients and corresponding 95% confidence intervals at quantile level $\tau = 0.5$.

Variable	CCA	ELW
Intercept	106.7102 (104.8740,110.6252)	107.4284 (105.1576,109.5222)
Alcohol	3.8952 (2.3896,4.6374)	3.0165 (1.9335,4.3078)
BMI	0.3171 (0.2074,0.3839)	0.3471 (0.2895,0.4032)
Age	4.4710 (4.0206,4.9693)	4.6465 (4.3142,4.9658)
Age^2	0.5327 (0.3018,0.8199)	0.2171 (0.0417,0.3962)